APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/653,028	08/28/2003	Richard Mark Exley	38481-8048US	1558

25096	7590	09/06/2006

PERKINS COIE LLP
PATENT-SEA
P.O. BOX 1247
SEATTLE, WA 98111-1247

EXAMINER
NGUYEN, VAN H

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2194	

DATE MAILED: 09/06/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
Office Action Summary	10/653,028	EXLEY ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	VAN H. NGUYEN	2194	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
  Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *28 August 2003*.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**.   2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-41* is/are pending in the application.

    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-41* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☒ The drawing(s) filed on *28 August 2003* is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☒ objected to by the Examiner.

    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

    a)☐ All   b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

        1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

        2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

        3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1)☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2)☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3)☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

4)☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .

5)☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)

6)☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1.   This communication is responsive to the application filed 08/28/2003.

Claims 1-41 are currently pending in this application. Claims 1, 6, 11, 19, 26, 32, and 37

are independent claims.

Examiner requests that Applicant review the application carefully for informalities

including typographical errors.

Oath/Declaration

2.   The Office acknowledges receipt of a properly signed Oath/Declaration received

12/05/2003.

Drawings

3.   Applicant has filed formal drawings for this application on 08/28/2003. However, figure

1 should be designated by a legend such as --Prior Art-- because only that which is old is

illustrated. See MPEP § 608.02(g). Corrected drawings in compliance with 37 CFR

1.121(d) are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the

application. The replacement sheet(s) should be labeled "Replacement Sheet" in the page

header (as per 37 CFR 1.84(c)) so as not to obstruct any portion of the drawing figures. If

the changes are not accepted by the examiner, the applicant will be notified and informed

of any required corrective action in the next Office action. The objection to the drawings

will not be held in abeyance.

Claim Objections

4.   Claims 9, 10, 17, 18, 20, 21, 27, 33, 40, and 41 are objected to because of the following

informalities: the abbreviations used in these claims should be defined. Appropriate

correction is required

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

5.   The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the

basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b),by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2)a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a)shall have the effects for the purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2)of such treaty in the English language; or " (Emphasis added.)

Claims 1-41 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by **Upton** (Pub. No.

US 2003/0093575 A1).

As to claim 1:

Upton teaches the invention as claimed including an architecture *(e.g., integration architecture)* in a computer system for execution of processes *(e.g., enterprise applications)* using an integration environment *[see the integration architecture discussion beginning at ¶0031]*, comprising:

- an application service interface *(e.g., an application view)* for each application *(e.g., an application)* that interfaces with a process, the application service interfaces being independent of the integration environment *(e.g., provide a simple, self-describing view, consistent interface to services and event/an application view can be an integral part of an integration framework when used as an interface object...can be defined for only the business or other capabilities that are applicable for a specific purpose) [see the application view discussion beginning at ¶0033]*; and

- a common service interface *(e.g., a web service interface)* for each type of service provided through the application service interfaces, the common service interface for a type of service *(e.g., a web service)* being independent of the application service interfaces through which that type of service is provided *[see the discussion beginning at ¶0041; see also the events ad services discussion beginning at ¶0065]*.

As to claim 2:

Upton teaches the processes interface with the common service interfaces so that the

processes are independent of the particular applications selected to support the types of

services and independent of the particular integration environment selected *[see ¶¶0041;*

0065-0068; and 0098-0105].

As to claim 3:

Upton teaches the integration environment is provided by an integration server *(e.g., an*

application integration server; see ¶0108).

As to claim 4:

Upton teaches the application service interfaces and the common service interfaces are

used for an application to access a service of a process and for a process to access

services of an application *[see ¶¶0041 and 0065-0068]*.

As to claim 5:

Upton teaches the processes are integration processes that are independent of the

particular integration environment and particular applications that support a type of

service *[see ¶¶0033-0038]*.

As to claim 6:

Note the discussion of claim 1 above for rejection.

As to claim 7:

Upton teaches a function of the application service interface for an application that provides a type of service translates its invocation by a function of the common service interface for that type of service to an invocation of one or more functions of the application and translates its invocation by the application to invocations of one or more functions of the common service interface *[see ¶¶0065-0068 and 0079]*.

As to claim 8:

Upton teaches a function of the common service interface for a type of service transforms its invocation by integration processes to invocations of one or more functions of an application service interface for an application that provides that type of service and transforms its invocation by a function of an application service interface of the application to invocations of one or more functions of the integration processes *[see ¶¶0045 and 0065-0068]*.

As to claim 9:

Upton teaches the implementations are provided by XSLT transforms *(e.g., XSLT; see ¶0045)*.

As to claim 10:

Upton teaches the common service interface and the application service interface are

defined using WSDL *(e.g., WSDL; see ¶0041).*

As to claim 11:

The rejection of claim 1 above is incorporated herein in full. Additionally, Upton teaches

an integration server *(e.g., an application integration server; see ¶0108).*

As to claim 12:

Upton teaches the provided implementations use an application service interface for each

application that is independent of the integration servers *[see ¶¶0045 and 0065-0068].*

As to claim 13:

Upton teaches providing an implementation of the application service interface for each

application *[see ¶¶0045 and 0065-0068].*

As to claim 14:

Upton teaches an implementation of an application service interface for an application

translates invocations of functions of the application service interface by an

implementation of a function of a common service interface to invocations of one or

more functions of the application and translates invocations of functions of the

application service interface by the application to invocations of one or more functions of

the common service interface *[see ¶¶0065-0068 and 0079]*.

As to claim 15:

Upton teaches the provided implementations transform invocations of functions of the

common service interface by the integration process to invocations of one or more

functions of an application and transform invocations of functions of the common service

interface by an application to invocations of one or more functions of the integration

process *[see ¶¶0045 and 0065-0068]*.

As to claim 16:

Upton teaches the application invokes the common service interface through an

application service interface *[see ¶0041]*.

As to claim 17:

Refer to claim 10 above for rejection.

As to claim 18:

Refer to claim 9 above for rejection.

As to claim 19:

The rejection of claim 1 above is incorporated herein in full. Additionally, Upton teaches providing instructions that transform invocations of functions of the common service interface for that type of service by an integration process to invocations of one or more functions of an application service interface of an application that provides that type of service *[see ¶0045]*, and translate invocations of functions of the application service interface by an application that provides that type of service to an integration process to invocations of one or more functions of the common service interface for that type of service *[see ¶ 0079]*.

As to claim 20:

Refer to claim 10 above for rejection.

As to claim 21:

Refer to claim 9 above for rejection.

As to claim 22:

Upton teaches providing functions for mapping identifiers from different applications for the same information to a common identifier *[see ¶¶0160-0161]*.

As to claim 23:

Upton teaches providing definitions of common objects that are used by the integration

processes *[see ¶0090]*.

As to claim 24:

Upton teaches the instructions that transform provide semantic transformation between

the application service interface and the common service interface *[see ¶0045]*.

As to claim 25:

Upton teaches an integration server provides an interface to an application and including

providing a translator that translates the interface provided by the integration server to the

application service interface for that application *[see ¶ 0079]*.

As to claim 26:

The rejection of claim 1 above is incorporated herein in full. Additionally, Upton teaches

providing instructions that translate invocations of functions of the application service

interface for that application by an integration process to invocations of one or more

functions of an integration server interface of that application, and translate invocations

of functions of the integration server interface for that application by that application to

invocations of one or more functions of the application service interface for that

application that execute instructions of the integration process so that an integration

process can be developed to use the application service interface *[see ¶¶0065-0068 and*

0079].

As to claims 27-29:

Refer to claims 10, 22, and 23, respectively, for rejections.

As to claim 30:

Upton teaches the instructions that translate provide syntactic translation between the

application service interface and the integration server interface *[see ¶ 0079]*.

As to claim 31:

Upton teaches the integration server interface of an application provides an interface to

an application program interface provided by the application *(see ¶0108)*.

As to claim 32:

The rejection of claim 1 above is incorporated herein in full. Additionally, Upton teaches

providing instructions that convert invocations of functions of the common service

interface for that type of service by an integration process to invocations of one or more

functions of the integration server interface of the application that provides that type of

service; and convert invocations of functions of the integration service interface by an

application that provides that type of service to invocations of one or more functions of

the common service interface for that type of service *[see ¶¶0065-0068 and 0079].*

As to claim 33:

Refer to claim 10 above for rejection.

As to claim 34:

Upton teaches the provided instructions that convert invocations of functions perform a

semantic transformation of function invocations between the common service interface

[see ¶0045] and an application service interface and perform a syntactic translation of

function invocations between the application service interface and an integration server

interface *[see ¶ 0079]*

As to claims 35 and 36:

Refer to claims 22 and 23, respectively, for rejections.

As to claim 37:

The rejection of claim 1 above is incorporated herein in full. Additionally, Upton teaches

an integration server *(e.g., an application integration server; see ¶0108).*

As to claims 38-41:

Refer to claims 7-10, respectively, for rejections.

Conclusion

6.   The prior art made of record, see PTO 892, and not relied upon is considered pertinent to

applicant's disclosure. Applicant should review these references carefully before

responding to this office action.

Contact Information

7.   Any inquiry or a general nature or relating to the status of this application should

be directed to the TC 2100 Group receptionist: (571) 272-2100.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the

examiner should be directed to VAN H. NGUYEN whose telephone number is (571)

272-3765. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Thursday from 8:30AM

6:00PM. The examiner can also be reached on alternative Friday. If attempts to reach the

examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, WILLIAM

THOMSON can be reached at (571) 272-3718.

The fax phone number for the organization where this application or

proceeding is assigned is (571) 273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the

Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Any response to this action should be mailed to:
Commissioner for patents
P O Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Van H. Nguyen
Patent Examiner, AU 2194